

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

ml

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/928,861	09/12/97	NEYMAN	I P3251

<input type="checkbox"/>	LM91/0514	<input type="checkbox"/>	EXAMINER
DONALD R BOYS		HOOSAIN, A	
P O BOX 187		<input type="checkbox"/>	ART UNIT
AROMAS CA 95004		<input type="checkbox"/>	PAPER NUMBER
		2742	<i>b</i>
		DATE MAILED:	05/14/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/928,861	Applicant Neyman, et al.
Examiner Allan Hoosain	Group Art Unit 2742

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 16, 1999

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 2-18 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 2-18 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 2-8 and 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Iwami et al.** (US Patent 5,604,737).

As to Claims 2,10,13, with respect to Figures 1-2 and 6, **Iwami et al.** teach a voice communication method for routing Internet Protocol Network Telephony (IPNT) calls at customer premises having a communication server, 20, (managing processor) and communication terminals, 10, including screen displays (video display units (VDUs)) connected on a local area network (LAN), 1, also coupled to the communication server (managing processor), the voice communication method comprising steps of:

a) receiving an incoming IPNT call at the communication server (managing processor) (Col. 11, lines 19-25);

Art Unit: 2742

- b) determining an intended communication terminal (recipient) for the call among the communications terminals (computer workstations) connected on the LAN (Col. 11, lines 27-44);
- c) requesting routing from a set of voice or mail notification messages (current routing rules) selectable (accessible and editable) by the intended communication terminal (recipient) (Col. 16, lines 1-18); and
- d) routing the call according to the current voice or mail notification messages (routing rules) of the intended communication terminal (recipient) (Col. 16, lines 4-11 and Col. 8, lines 1-14 and Col. 4, lines 24-40).

As to Claims 3,17, in addition to the information above, **Iwami et al.** further teach the voice communication method of Claim 2 wherein the selectable notification messages (editable routing rules) for the intended communication terminal (recipient) are maintained at the intended communication terminal (recipient's computer workstation) (Col. 8, lines 4-14).

As to Claims 4,14,18, in addition to the information above, **Iwami et al.** further teach the voice communication method of Claim 2 wherein the selectable notification messages (editable routing rules) for the intended communication terminal (recipient) are maintained on a central client-server router,²⁰ executed on a processor connected to the LAN (Figure 6 and Col. 8, lines 1-28 and Col. 16, lines 4-18).

Art Unit: 2742

As to Claims 5,11,15, in addition to the information above, **Iwami et al.** further teach the voice communication method of Claim 4 wherein the processor connected on the LAN is the managing processor for the voice communication system (call center) (Col. 10, lines 59-65).

As to Claims 6,12,16, in addition to the information above, **Iwami et al.** further teach the voice communication method of Claim 4 wherein the processor executing the client-server router is a processor connected to the LAN separate from the managing processor (Figure 2 and Col. 7, lines 40-47).

As to Claim 7, in addition to the information above, **Iwami et al.** further teach the voice communication method of Claim 2 comprising a step executed by an intended communication terminal (recipient) for “editing the routing rules via an inherent interactive Graphical User Interface (GUI) executing on the intended communication terminal (recipient’s computer workstation)” (Col. 8, lines 7-14).

As to Claim 8, in addition to the information above, **Iwami et al.** further teach the voice communication method of Claim 4 wherein the communication terminal (client-server router) has voice and text (router-rule portions) dedicated to individual agents at individual ones of the communication terminals (computer workstation) connected to the LAN, and wherein an individual agent, through an inherent user interface executing on a communication terminal

Art Unit: 2742

(computer workstation), may access the voice or text portion dedicated to that agent, and select (edit) the routing rules therein (Col. 8, lines 1-14 and Figure 3, labels 31-32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Iwami et al.** as applied to Claim 8 above and further in view of **McCalmont et al.** (US Patent 5,621,789).

Art Unit: 2742

As to Claim 9, **Iwami et al.** teach the voice communication method of Claim 8 wherein the screen display (user interface) comprises an inherent graphical user interface (GUI) but not having icons indicating telephone calls received and for choices of disposition of telephone calls received, and including steps for a user to precipitate actions in call routing by iconic drag-and-drop procedures. A person of ordinary skill using **Iwami et al.**'s invention would want to know how the screen display of **Iwami et al.**'s invention works. **McCalmont et al.** teach a computer workstation in a call center with telephone icons indicating telephone calls received and choices for disposition of telephone calls received, and including steps for a user to use window operations (precipitate actions in call routing by iconic drag-and-drop procedures) (Figures 5a, 5b, 6a and 6b). Since, **Iwami et al.** and **McCalmont et al.** are in analogous workstation activities, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to add the icon capability of **McCalmont et al.**'s invention to the screen display capability of **Iwami et al.**'s invention for a computer workstation to have icons indicating telephone calls received and for choices of disposition of telephone calls received, and including steps for a user to precipitate actions in call routing by iconic drag-and-drop procedures.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Examiner agreed with Applicants' remarks in Paper #5,

Art Unit: 2742

dated 2/26/99, that **Meermans** does not teach IPNT call routing as described by Applicants and, hence, the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wolff et al. (US Patent 5,327,486) teach a call management method for routing calls based on user profiles.

Henley et al. (US Patent 5,526,353) teach a computer system for routing voice calls using LANs.

Baran et al. (US Patent 4,771,425) teaches the routing of PBX calls over packet networks.

Focsaneanu et al. (US Patent 5,610,910) teach an access computer for selectively routing calls over the Internet or PSTN.

Kubler et al. (US Patent 5,726,984) teach a computer system for conducting voice communications over the Internet.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2742

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5403 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,
Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner
should be directed to **Allan Hoosain** whose telephone number is (703) 305-4012. The examiner
can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,
Krista Zele, can be reached on (703) 305-4701.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Allan Hoosain *AM*

Patent Examiner

April 30, 1999



KRISTA ZELE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700